arXiv:1504.02453v2 [math.PR] 21 May 2015

# QUENCHED CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREMS
# FOR A STATIONARY LINEAR PROCESS

Dalibor Volný and Michael Woodroofe

Abstract. We establish a sufficient condition under which a central limit theorem for a a stationary linear process is quenched. We find a stationary linear process for which the Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition is satisfied, $\sigma_n = \|S_n\|_2 = o(\sqrt{n})$, $S_n/\sigma_n$ converge to the standard normal law, and the convergence is not quenched; the weak invariance principle does not hold.

## 1. Introduction.

Let $T$ be an ergodic automorphism of a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$. For $h \in L^2$, $Uh = h \circ T$ is a unitary operator; we will freely switch from the notation $h \circ T^i$ to $U^i h$ and vice versa.

Let $(\mathcal{F}_i)_i$ be a filtration such that $\mathcal{F}_{i+1} = T^{-1}\mathcal{F}_i$, and $e \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_0) \ominus L^2(\mathcal{F}_{-1})$. For simplicity we will suppose $\|e\|_2 = 1$. Let $a_i$ be real numbers with $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i^2 < \infty$ and let

$$f = \sum_{i\le 0} a_{-i} U^i e.$$

Then $f \in L^2$ and we say that $(f \circ T^i)_i$ is a causal stationary linear process. The stationary linear process is a classical and important case of a (strictly) stationary process and, moreover, any regular stationary process is a sum of stationary linear process "living" in mutually orthogonal and $U$-invariant subspaces of $L^2$ (cf. [VWoZ]). If $e_k \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_0) \ominus L^2(\mathcal{F}_{-1})$, $\|e_k\|_2 = 1$ are mutually orthogonal, $a_{k,i}$ are real numbers with $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_{k,i}^2 < \infty$, and if

$$f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i\le 0} a_{k,-i} U^i e_k \tag{1}$$

then we say that $(f \circ T^i)_i$ is a causal superlinear process. As shown in [VWoZ], if $f \in L^2$ is $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable and $E(f|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}) = 0$ (i.e. the process $(f \circ T^i)_i$ is regular) then a representation (1) exists.

Let us denote $S_n(f) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^i$. Recall ([PU06]) that if $\sigma_n = \|S_n(f)\|_2 \to \infty$ then the distributions of $S_n(f)/\sigma_n$ weakly converge to $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, i.e. we have a CLT. We will study when this CLT is quenched.

Let us suppose that the regular conditional probabilities $m_\omega$ with respect to the $\sigma$-field $\mathcal{F}_0$ exist. If for $\mu$ a.e. $\omega$ the distributions $m_\omega(S_n(f)/\sigma_n)^{-1}$ weakly converge

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F05, 60G10, 60G42, 28D05.

*Key words and phrases.* quenched central limit theorem, stationary linear process, martingale difference sequence, strictly stationary process, Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition.

to $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, we say that the CLT is quenched. A quenched CLT can be defined using Markov Chains. Any stationary process $(f \circ T^i)_i$ can be expressed using a homogeneous and stationary Markov Chain $(\xi_i)_i$ as $(g(\xi_i))_i$; a CLT is quenched if it takes place for a.e. starting point (this approach is probably earlier than our one; it has been used in e.g. [DLi]). Equivalence of both approaches was explained e.g. in [V].

In the next section, for a stationary linear processes, we will give a sufficient condition for a quenched CLT. Then, in Section 3, we will present a stationary linear processes $(f \circ T^i)_i$ for which the Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition and the Hannan's condition are satisfied but the CLT is not quenched and the weak invariance principle (WIP) does not hold. As we will explain in Remark 3, for norming by $\sqrt{n}$ the limit behaviour of the process is different.

**2. A Sufficient Condition.** Let $(e \circ T^i)$ be a martingale difference sequence as defined in the introduction,

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i e \circ T^{-i}$$

where $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^2 < \infty$, and let $S_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^i$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. By definition,

$$S_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^j = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_i e \circ T^{j-i} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1} \sum_{j=k\vee 0}^{n-1} a_{j-k} e \circ T^k =$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k} e \circ T^k + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{0} (b_{n-k} - b_{-k}) e \circ T^k$$

where

$$u \vee v = \max\{u, v\}, \;\; b_0 = 0, \;\; b_j = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} a_i, \quad j \geq 1.$$

We denote

$$\bar{\sigma}_n^2 = E[(S_n - E(S_n|\mathcal{F}_0))^2] = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k}^2.$$

**Theorem 1.** *Let $\bar{\sigma}_n^2 \to \infty$. If*

(i) *$e \circ T^i$ are iid and $(\mathcal{F}_i)_i$ is the natural filtration*
*or if*

(ii)

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{k \leq n} \frac{n b_k^2}{\bar{\sigma}_n^2} = c < \infty \tag{2}$$

*then for $(1/\bar{\sigma_n})[S_n - E(S_n|\mathcal{F}_0)]$ a quenched CLT holds true.*

Remark 1. If the sums $b_k$ converge to a limit $b$ such that $\sigma_n^2/n \to b^2$ then the Heyde's condition (cf. e.g. [HaHe, Chapter 5]) is satisfied and we get a CLT. As proved in [VWo14], in general, for $S_n - E(S_n|\mathcal{F}_0)$ the CLT under Heyde's condition is not quenched. Our theorem shows that it is quenched in the particular case when $(f \circ T^i)$ is a stationary linear process.

Remark 2. Theorem 1 implies a quenched CLT for $S_n - E(S_n|\mathcal{F}_0)$ as soon as $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 < \infty$, $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \bar\sigma_n^2/n > 0$, and the sequence of $b_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i$ is bounded.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We have to prove a quenched CLT for the triangular array of random variables $b_{n-k} e\circ T^k/\bar\sigma_n$, $k = 1\dots, n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

The $e \circ T^k$ are iid and they remain iid for the conditional probabilities $m_\omega$ as well. From $\bar\sigma_n^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k^2 \to \infty$ we get the CLT.

Let $e\circ T^k$ be martingale differences and let (2) hold. To prove the CLT we use Lachout's refinement [L] of the McLeish's central limit theorem ([Mc]), applied to regular conditional probabilities with respect to the $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{F}_0$. We thus will prove

(a) $E\big(\max_{k\le n-1} |b_{n-k} e\circ T^k|/\bar\sigma_n \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_0\big) \to 0$ a.s.,
(b) $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k}^2 e^2 \circ T^k/\bar\sigma_n^2$ converge to a constant a.s..

By (2),

$$\frac{b_{n-k}^2}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \le \frac{c}{n}$$

for all $n$, $1 \le k \le n-1$, hence (a) follows in the same way as in [VWo14].

We will prove (b).

Denote

$$T_n f = \frac{1}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k}^2 f\circ T^k, \quad f \in L^1.$$

Recall the Banach's principle (cf. [K]):
If

(i) $T_n : L^1 \to L^1$ are continuous,
(ii) for every $f \in L^1$, $\sup_n |T_n f| < \infty$ a.e.,
(iii) there is a dense subset of $h \in L^1$ for which $T_n h$ converges a.s.,

then for all $f \in L^1$, $T_n f$ converge a.s..

We will verify (i)-(iii).

(i) follows from the definition.

For (ii),

$$|T_n f| \le \frac{1}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k}^2 |f|\circ T^k \le \frac{c}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |f|\circ T^k$$

hence, by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem,

$$\sup |T_n f| < \infty \quad a.s. \quad \forall f \in L^1.$$

Let us prove (iii). Let $f = g - g \circ T$, $g \in L^\infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} T_n f &= \frac{1}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k}^2 [g \circ T^k - g \circ T^{k+1}] = \\ &= \frac{1}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} [b_{n-k}^2 - b_{n-k+1}^2] g \circ T^k + \frac{b_n^2}{\bar\sigma_n^2} g \circ T \le \\ &\le \frac{1}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} (b_{n-k} + b_{n-k+1})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{n-k+1}^2} \|g\|_\infty + \frac{c}{n} \|g\|_\infty \le \\ &\le \frac{2}{\bar\sigma_n} \sqrt{1 + \frac{c}{n}} A \|g\|_\infty + \frac{c}{n} \|g\|_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $A^2 = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k^2 < \infty$, hence $T_n f \to 0$ a.s..

The set of functions $c + g - g \circ T$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $g \in L^\infty$, is dense in $L^1$; for $f' = g - g \circ T$ we have $T_n f \to 0$ a.s. by the calculation above, for $f'' = c$ we have $T_n f'' = f'' \equiv c$ hence the convergence towards $c$ takes place for $f = f' + f''$.

By the Banach's principle we conclude that

$$T_n e^2 = \frac{1}{\bar\sigma_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{n-k}^2 e^2 \circ T^k \tag{4}$$

converges almost surely for every $e \in L^2$.
Let $f^*$ be the limit in (4). Using a similar calculation as in (3) we can see that $T_n e^2 - (T_n e^2) \circ T \to 0$ in $L^1$ hence $f^* = f^* \circ T$. By ergodicity, $f^*$ is a constant a.s..

□

## 3. A Non-quenched CLT.

Recall that if the process $(f \circ T^i)$ is adapted and regular and if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty,$$

we say that the Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition takes place. If for $P_0 f = E(f \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0) - E(f \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{-1})$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|P_0 U^i f\|_2 < \infty$$

and $(f \circ T^i)$ is adapted and regular then we say that the Hannan's condition takes place.

**Theorem 2.** *There exists a causal stationary linear process $(f \circ T^i)$ with martingale difference innovations such that*

- **(i)** *the Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition and the Hannan's condition are satisfied,*
- **(ii)** *for $\sigma_n = \|S_n(f)\|_2$, $\sigma_n \to \infty$, $\sigma_n/\sqrt{n} \to 0$, $\|E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2/\sigma_n \to 0$, i.e. $\bar\sigma_n/\sigma_n \to 1$,*
- **(iii)** *$S_n(f)/\sigma_n$ converge in distribution to the standard normal law $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$,*
- **(iv)** *the convergence is not quenched neither for $S_n(f)/\sigma_n$ nor for $(S_n(f) - E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0))/\sigma_n$,*
- **(v)** *the WIP does not hold.*

Remark 3: When norming by $\sqrt{n}$, the Hannan's condition implies the WIP. For $S_n(f) - E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)$ the invariance principle is quenched (cf. [CuV]), for $S_n(f)$ the CLT is not quenched (cf. [VWo10]).

Remark 4: As shown in [CuMe], Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition implies a quenched CLT and WIP for $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n}$ (cf. also [PU]).

*Proof.* We will find a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_i)_i$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{i+1} = T^{-1}\mathcal{F}_i$ and $e \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_0) \ominus L^2(\mathcal{F}_{-1})$, $\|e\|_2 = 1$. The construction of $e$ and $(\mathcal{F}_i)_i$ will be presented later; it will be needed for the proof of (**iv**) and (**v**) only.

We define a function $f$ by

$$f = e + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{-\gamma_k}{V_k} \sum_{i=1}^{V_k} U^{-i}e$$

where $\gamma_k > 0$, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k = 1$, $V_k \nearrow \infty$, are such that

$$\|S_n(f)\|_2 \to \infty, \quad \frac{\|S_n(f)\|_2}{\sqrt{n}} \to 0, \quad \frac{\|E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{\|S_n(f)\|_2} \to 0,$$
$$\text{and} \quad \frac{S_n(f)}{\|S_n(f)\|_2} \to N(0,1).$$

To do so, we define

$$\gamma_k = \frac{2}{k+2} \prod_{j=1}^{k} (1 - \frac{1}{j+1}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots.$$

From

$$\gamma_k = 2\prod_{j=1}^{k} (1 - \frac{1}{j+1}) - 2\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \frac{1}{j+1})$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{k} (1 - \frac{1}{j+1}) = 0$$

we deduce

$$\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \gamma_j = 2\prod_{j=1}^{k} (1 - \frac{1}{j+1}).$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k = 1, \quad 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \gamma_j = 2\prod_{j=1}^{k} (1 - \frac{1}{j+1}) = (k+2)\gamma_k.$$

The numbers $V_k$ will be specified later. We suppose that $V_k$ grow at least exponentially fast.

We have

$$\Big\|\frac{\gamma_k}{V_k}\sum_{i=1}^{V_k}U^{-i}e\Big\|_2=\frac{\gamma_k}{\sqrt{V_k}}$$

which guarantees that

$$f=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\gamma_k\Big(e-\frac{1}{V_k}\sum_{i=1}^{V_k}U^{-i}e\Big)=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\gamma_k f_k\in L^2$$

where

$$f_k=e-\frac{1}{V_k}\sum_{i=1}^{V_k}U^{-i}e=g_k-Ug_k,\quad g_k=-\frac{1}{V_k}\sum_{j=1}^{V_k}jU^{-V_k-1+j}e.$$

For $h=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}c_iU^{-i}e$ we have

$$S_n(h)=\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}c_iU^{j-i}e=\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-1}\sum_{j=\max\{0,u\}}^{n-1}c_{j-u}U^ue. \tag{5}$$

Let us denote

$$f_k=e-\frac{1}{V_k}\sum_{i=1}^{V_k}U^{-i}e=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}c_{k,i}U^{-i}e.$$

We then have

$$\begin{gathered}
\Big|\sum_{j=0\vee u}^{n-1}c_{k,j-u}\Big|\le 1\ \text{ for every }\ u,\\
\Big|\sum_{j=0\vee u}^{n-1}c_{k,j-u}\Big|\le\frac{n}{V_k}\ \text{ for }\ -1\ge u\ge -V_k,\\
\Big|\sum_{j=0\vee u}^{n-1}c_{k,j-u}\Big|=0\ \text{ for }\ u<-V_k\\
\sum_{j=0\vee u}^{n-1}c_{k,j-u}\ge 0\vee 1-\frac{n}{V_k}\ \text{ for }\ u\ge 0.
\end{gathered}\tag{6}$$

We deduce that for every $V_k$,

$$\|S_n(f_k)\|_2=\Big\|S_n\Big(e-\frac{1}{V_k}\sum_{i=1}^{V_k}U^{-i}e\Big)\Big\|_2\le\sqrt{2n}$$

hence by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem

$$\frac{\|S_n(f)\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}\le\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\gamma_k\frac{\|S_n(f_k)\|_2}{\sqrt{n}}\to 0. \tag{7}$$

Recall that

$$1-\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\gamma_j=\sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty}\gamma_j=(k+4)\gamma_{k+2}.$$

For $V_k\le n<V_{k+1}$ we using (5), (6), and the (at least) exponential growth of the $V_k$ get

(8)

$$\|S_n(f)\|_2\ge\|S_n(f)-E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2\ge\sqrt{n-1}\big(1-\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\gamma_j-\sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty}\frac{V_{k+1}}{V_j}\gamma_j\big)\ge$$
$$\ge C\sqrt{n}(k+4)\gamma_{k+2}$$

for some constant $C>0$. Supposing

$$\sqrt{V_k}\big(1-\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\gamma_j\big)\to\infty$$

we thus get

$$\|S_n(f)\|_2\to\infty. \tag{9}$$

Using the (at least) exponential growth of the $V_k$ again we have, for $V_k\le n<V_{k+1}$,

$$\|E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2\sim(\gamma_k+\gamma_{k+1})\sqrt{n}. \tag{10}$$

To prove this, first recall that $f_j=g_j-Ug_j$ where $g_j\in L^2$. If $V_k$ is large enough we thus get $\|E(S_n(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}f_j)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2=o(n)$. For $V_{k+2}$ large enough we get $\|E(S_n(\sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty}f_j)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2=o(n)$ by (6).
Using (5) and (6) we can see that

$$\|E(S_n(f_k)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2^2=\frac{1}{V_k^2}\sum_{j=1}^{V_k}j^2\sim V_k$$

and

$$\|E(S_n(f_{k+1})\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2^2\le V_{k+1}+1.$$

Because $\gamma_k\sim\gamma_{k+1}$ we get (10).

By definition,

$$\gamma_k=\frac{1}{k+2}\big(1-\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\gamma_j\big)$$

hence by (8) and (10) we have

$$\frac{\|E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{\|S_n(f)\|_2}\to 0. \tag{11}$$

From (9), (7), and (11) we get (**ii**).

By [PU06] and $\sigma_n^2 \to \infty$ we get the central limit theorem (**iii**).

*The Hannan's and Maxwell-Woodroofe's condition*

We have $\|P_0 U^i f\|_2 = |a_i|$, $i \geq 0$, where $f = a_0 e - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i U^{-i} e$. From the definition of $f$ we deduce that $a_0 = 1$ and $a_i > 0$ for $i \geq 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i = 1$. This implies the Hannan's condition.

Denote

$$h_k = \frac{-\gamma_k}{V_k} \sum_{i=1}^{V_k} U^{-i} e, \quad f' = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_k;$$

we thus have $f = e - f'$. By (6), for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\|S_n(h_k)\|_2^2 \leq \gamma_k^2 2V_k \Big(\frac{n}{V_k}\Big)^2 = 2\gamma_k^2 \frac{n^2}{V_k}, \quad n = 1, 2, ..., V_k$$

and

$$\|E(S_n(h_k) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = \|E(S_{V_k}(h_k) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 \leq \gamma_k \sqrt{V_k}, \quad n \geq V_k$$

hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|E(S_n(h_k) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} \leq \sqrt{2}\gamma_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_k}} \sum_{n=1}^{V_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \gamma_k \sqrt{V_k} \sum_{n=V_k+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \leq C\gamma_k$$

for some constant $C$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|E(S_n(f') \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|E(S_n(h_k) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k = C < \infty$$

and (**i**) follows.

*The filtration and e*

For all what have been proved up to now we supposed only that $(e \circ T^i)_i$ are martingale differences and that $\|e\|_2 = 1$. In order to get (**iv**) and (**v**) we will need a particular choice of the filtration and of $e$.

Let $\mathcal{B}_k', \mathcal{B}_l'' \subset \mathcal{A}$, $k, l = 1, 2, \ldots$, be mutually independent $\sigma$-algebras,

$$\mathcal{B}_k' \subset T^{-1}\mathcal{B}_k', \quad \cap_{j=1}^{\infty} T^j \mathcal{B}_k' = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_l'' = T^{-1}\mathcal{B}_l''$$

(modulo sets of measure 0 or 1) for every $k, l$; $\xi_k \circ T^i$ are iid $\mathcal{B}_k'$-measurable random variables, $\mu(\xi_k = 1) = 1/2 = \mu(\xi_k = -1)$ for all $i$.

All these objects can be constructed by taking finite alphabets $\mathbb{A}_k'$ and $\mathbb{A}_l''$, $k, l = 1, 2, \ldots$, $\Omega_k' = \underset{i \in \mathbb{Z}}{\times} \mathbb{A}_{k,i}'$ where $\mathbb{A}_{k,i}'$ are identical copies of $\mathbb{A}_k'$, similarly we define $\Omega_l''$, $k, l = 1, 2, \ldots$. On the sets $\Omega_k'$ and $\Omega_l''$ we define product $\sigma$-algebras, product measures, and left shift transformations $T_k'$, $T_l''$. $\Omega$ is the product of all $\Omega_k'$ and $\Omega_l''$ equipped with the product $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, the product (probability) measure $\mu$, and the product transformation $T$. For projections $\xi_k$ and $\zeta_l$ of $\Omega$ onto $\mathbb{A}_{k,0}'$ and $\mathbb{A}_{l,0}''$ we thus get mutually independent processes of iid $(\xi_k \circ T^i)_i$, $(\zeta_l \circ T^i)_i$. We suppose that $\mathbb{A}'_k = \mathbb{A}''_k = \{-1, 1\}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and $\mu(\xi_k = 1) = 1/2 = \mu(\xi_k = -1) = \mu(\zeta_k = 1) = \mu(\zeta_k = -1)$. For $\mathcal{B}'_k$ we take the past $\sigma$-algebras $\sigma\{\xi_k \circ T^i : i \le 0\}$ and for $\mathcal{B}''_l$ we take the $\sigma$-algebras $\sigma\{\zeta_l \circ T^i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The properties above can be easily verified, the latter follow from Kolmogorov's 0-1 law.

We thus have that $\xi_k \circ T^i$ are iid $T^{-i}\mathcal{B}'_k$-measurable random variables, $\mu(\xi_k = 1) = 1/2 = \mu(\xi_k = -1)$.

Recall that $\sigma_n/\sqrt{n} = \|S_n(f)\|_2/\sqrt{n} \to 0$ (cf. (7)). We thus can suppose that $N_k$ is big enough so that for $k$ odd,

$$2^k \sigma_{N_k} \le \frac{\sqrt{N_k}}{k^{3/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad N_{k+1} = 4N_k, \quad \sigma_{4N_k} \le 2\sigma_{N_k}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4N_k} < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{12}$$

For $k = 1, 2, \dots$, let $A_k \in \mathcal{B}''_k$ be sets such that $T^{-i}A_k$, $i = 0, \dots, 3N_k$ are mutually disjoint (hence $\{T^{-i}A_k : i = 0, \dots, 3N_k\}$ are Rokhlin towers) and $\mu(A_k) = 1/(4N_k)$ (existence of Rokhlin Towers is proved e.g. in [CSF]). From (12) if follows

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_k) < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{13}$$

By $\mathcal{B}''$ we define the $\sigma$-algebra generated by all $\mathcal{B}''_k$; we thus have $T^{-1}\mathcal{B}'' = \mathcal{B}''$, all Rokhlin towers defined above are $\mathcal{B}''$-measurable.
By $\mathcal{F}_j$ we denote the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $\mathcal{B}''$ and all $\xi_k \circ T^i$, $i \le j$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$; notice that $T^{-1}\mathcal{F}_j = \mathcal{F}_{j+1}$.

For $d = 2(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1/k^3)^{-1/2}$ we define

$$e_k = d\xi_k \frac{\sqrt{N_k}}{k^{3/2}} 1_{A_k}, \quad e = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e_k.$$

Notice that $\|e_k\|_2 = d/(2k^{3/2})$ hence $e \in L^2$. By definition, $e$ is $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable. By definition, $e_k$ are mutually independent hence $\|e\|_2^2 = (d^2/4)\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1/k^3$; we thus have $\|e\|_2 = 1$.
Because $A_k \in \mathcal{B}''$ and $\xi_k$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{-1}$, we have $E(e_k \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{-1}) = 0$ for every $k$ hence $E(e \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{-1}) = 0$, $(U^i e)_i$ is thus a martingale difference sequence adapted to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_i)$.

Recall that

$$f = e + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{-\gamma_k}{V_k} \sum_{i=1}^{V_k} U^{-i} e = a_0 e - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i U^{-i} e$$

where $a_0 = 1$, $a_i > 0$ for all $i \ge 1$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i = 1$.

By $m_\omega$ we will denote regular conditional probabilities w.r.t. $\mathcal{F}_0$ ($\mathcal{A}$ is a Borel $\sigma$-algebra of a Polish space hence the regular conditional probabilities exist). Notice that all sets $T^{-i}A_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, are $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable hence $m_\omega(T^{-i}A_k) = 0$ (if $\omega \notin T^{-i}A_k$) or $m_\omega(T^{-i}A_k) = 1$ (if $\omega \in T^{-i}A_k$).

Let us fix a $k \ge 1$ odd and denote

$$A'_k = A_k \setminus \bigcup_{j \ne k} A_j.$$

By (13) and independence, $\mu(A'_k) \geq \mu(A_k)/2$. The sets $A'_k, \dots, T^{-3N_k+1}A'_k$ are mutually disjoint and $\mu(A_k) \geq 1/(4N_k)$ hence

$$\mu\Big(\bigcup_{N=0}^{N_k-1} T^{-N+1}A'_k\Big) \geq \frac{1}{8}. \tag{14}$$

We have

$$\begin{gathered}
S_N(f) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} U^j\Big(e - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i U^{-i}e\Big) = \\
U^{N-1}e + \sum_{j=1}^{N-2} U^j e - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0\vee 1-i}^{N-1} a_{i+j}U^{-i}e + e - \sum_{i=2-N}^{-1}\sum_{j=1-i}^{N-1} a_{i+j}U^{-i}e = \\
U^{N-1}e + I - II + III - IV.
\end{gathered} \tag{15}$$

Let us suppose that $N_k \leq N < N_{k+1} = 4N_k$ ($k$ is odd). For $\omega \in T^{-N+1}A'_k$ we have

$$m_\omega\big(U^{N-1}e = d\frac{\sqrt{N_k}}{k^{3/2}}\big) = m_\omega\big(U^{N-1}e = -d\frac{\sqrt{N_k}}{k^{3/2}}\big) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

$-II + III = E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ hence it is a constant $m_\omega$ almost surely.
$U^{N-1}e + I - IV$ is (an infinite) linear combination of products of $U^i\xi_l$ with $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable functions, $1 \leq i \leq N-1$. Because $\mathcal{F}_0$, $U^i\xi_l$, $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, are mutually independent, $U^i\xi_l$, $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, are iid with respect to the measure $m_\omega$ and $m_\omega(\xi_l = \pm 1) = 1/2$ (for $\mu$ a.e. $\omega$). Therefore, $I - IV$ is a symmetric random variable independent of $U^{N-1}e$ w.r.t. $m_\omega$; $U^{N-1}e + I - IV = S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ is a symmetric random variable as well.

We thus have

$$m_\omega\big(|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)| \geq d\frac{\sqrt{N_k}}{k^{3/2}}\big) = m_\omega\big(|U^{N-1}e + I - IV| \geq d\frac{\sqrt{N_k}}{k^{3/2}}\big) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

From (15) and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i = 1$ we by direct calculation deduce that $\sigma_n \leq \sigma_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Using (12) we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
m_\omega\Big(\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_N} \geq 2^k\frac{\sigma_{N_k}}{\sigma_N}\Big) &\geq \\
&m_\omega\Big(\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_N} \geq 2^{k-1}\Big) \geq \frac{1}{2}
\end{aligned}$$

Because $E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ is $m_\omega$ a.s. a constant and $S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ is a symmetric random variable, we get

$$m_\omega\Big(\frac{|S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_N} \geq 2^{k-1}\Big) \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

For any $K < \infty$ there thus exists a $k_0$ (with $2^{k_0-1} \geq K$) such that for an integer $k \geq k_0$ there exists a set $B_k = \cup_{N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} T^{-N+1}A'_k$ of measure bigger than 1/16 (cf.

(14)) such that for $\omega \in B_k$ and the probability $m_\omega$ there exists an $N_k \le N < N_{k+1}$ for which

$$(16) \qquad m_\omega\Big(\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_N} \ge K\Big) \ge \frac{1}{2}, \quad m_\omega\Big(\frac{|S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_N} K\Big) \ge \frac{1}{4}.$$

We conclude that there exists a set $B$ of positive measure such that for $\omega \in B$ there is an infinite sequence of $k$ (odd) and $N_k \le N \le N_{k+1}$ such that for the probability $m_\omega$, the laws of $(S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0))/\sigma_N$ and of $S_N(f)/\sigma_N$ do not weakly converge to $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. This proves that the CLT for $(S_n - E(S_n|\mathcal{F}_0))/\sigma_n$ and for $S_N(f)/\sigma_N$ are not quenched.

This finishes the proof of (**iv**).

We have proved (cf. (16)) that for any $K < \infty$, $k$ sufficiently big (with $2^{k-2} \ge K$), and $\omega \in B_k = \cup_{N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} T^{-N+1} A'_k$ ($B_k$ of measure bigger than 1/16),

$$m_\omega\Big(\bigcup_{N=N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} \Big\{\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_{N_{k+1}}} \ge K\Big\}\Big) \ge \frac{1}{2}$$

hence

$$\mu\Big(\bigcup_{N=N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} \Big\{\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_{N_{k+1}}} \ge K\Big\}\Big) = \\ \mu\Big(\max_{N_k \le N \le N_{k+1}-1} \Big\{\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_{N_{k+1}}} \ge K\Big\} \ge \frac{1}{32},$$

similarly we get

$$\mu\Big(\max_{N_k \le N \le N_{k+1}-1} \Big\{\frac{|S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)|}{\sigma_{N_{k+1}}} \ge K\Big\}\Big) \ge \frac{1}{64}.$$

This proves (**v**).

$\square$

Acknowledgement. The authors thank Professor Michael Lin for many helpful consultations.

## REFERENCES

[CFS] Cornfeld, I.P., Fomin, S.V., and Sinai, Ya.G., *Ergodic Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1982.

[CuMe] C. Cuny, F. Merlevède, *On martingale approximation and the quenched weak invariance principle*, Ann. Probab. **42** (2014), 760-793.

[CuP] C. Cuny, M. Peligrad, *Central limit theorem started at a point for stationary processes and additive functinals of reversible Markov chains*, J. of Theoretical Probability **25** (2012), 171-188.

[CuV] C. Cuny, D. Volný, *A quenched invariance principle for stationary processes*, ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. **10** (2013), 107-115.

[DLi] Y. Derriennic, M. Lin, *The central limit theorem for Markov chains with normal transition operators, started at a point*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **119** (2001), 509-528.

[HaHe] Hall, P. and Heyde, C.C., *Martingale Limit Theory and its Application*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.

[K] U. Krengel, *Ergodic Theorems*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1985.

[L] P. Lachout, *A note on the martingale central limit theorem*, Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae **26** (1985), 637-640.

[MWo] Maxwell, M. and Woodroofe, M., *Central limit theorems for additive functionals of Markov chains*, Ann. Probab. **28** (2000), 713-724.

[Mc] D.L. McLeish, *Dependent central limit theorems and invariance principles*, Ann. Probab. **2** (1974), 620-628.

[PU05] M. Peligrad, S. Utev, *A new maximal inequality and invariance principle for stationary sequences*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), 798-815.

[PU06] M. Peligrad, S. Utev, *Central limit theorem for stationary linear processes*, Ann. Probab. **34** (2006), 1241-1643.

[V] D. Volný, *Martingale approximation and optimality of some conditions for the central limit theorem,*, J. of Theoretical Probability **23** (2010), 888-903.

[VWo10] D. Volný, M. Woodroofe, *An example of non-quenched convergence in the conditional central limit theorem for partial sums of a linear process*, in Dependence in Probability, Analysis and Number Theory. A volume in memory of Walter Philipp. Edited by Istvan Berkes, Richard C. Bradley, Herold Dehling, Magda Peligrad and Robert Tichy, Kendrick Press, (2010), 317-323.

[VWoZ] D. Volný, M. Woodroofe, Ou Zhao, *Central limit theorems for superlinear processes*, Dynamics and Stochastics **11** (2011), 71-80.

[VWo14] D. Volný, M. Woodroofe:, *Quenched central limit theorems for sums of stationary processes,*, Stat. and Probab. Letters **85** (2014), 161-167.

Université de Rouen, Laboratoire Raphaël Salem UMR 6085 CNRS, Université de Rouen, Saint Étienne-du-Rouvray, France

University of Michigan, Department of Statistics, Ann Arbor, MI, USA